



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/550,578 | 10/20/2005 | Hiroataka Nishizawa | XA-10436 | 1323 |

181 7590 10/08/2008
MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

LABAZE, EDWYN

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2887

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

10/08/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocketing@milesstockbridge.com
sstiles@milesstockbridge.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/550,578 | Applicant(s) NISHIZAWA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner EDWYN LABAZE | Art Unit 2887 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/23/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2887

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of IDS filed on 9/23/2005.
2. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.
3. This application is a 371 of PCT/JP04/13929 filed on 09/24/2004.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,360,713 (hereinafter

Art Unit: 2887

referred as '713). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the claims are expressly found in the claimed application. For instance, claim 8 of the present application recites the following limitations:

A semiconductor device which comprises external interface terminals and processing circuits, and which is fed with an operating power source when detachably set in a host equipment, wherein: said external interface terminals include power source feeding terminals, an extraction detecting terminal, and other terminals; said power source feeding terminals are long enough to touch corresponding terminals of the host equipment for, at least, 1.0 millisecond since separation of said extraction detecting terminal from a corresponding terminal of the host equipment, with respect to an extraction speed of 2.5 meters/second; said processing circuits include an interface control circuit which is connected to said external interface terminals, and a rewritable nonvolatile memory which is controlled by said interface control circuit; said nonvolatile memory stores information on the basis of a difference of threshold voltages of memory cells; and said interface control circuit causes said nonvolatile memory midway of a rewrite process to complete a predetermined process, before cutoff of the power source after the separation of said extraction detecting terminal from the corresponding terminal of the host equipment.

Whereas claim 4 in '713 application, the applicant claims

A semiconductor device which comprises external interface terminals and processing circuits, and which couples to an operating power source when detachably set in a host equipment, wherein: the external interface terminals include power source feeding terminals, an extraction detecting terminal, and other terminals; the power source feeding terminals are long

Art Unit: 2887

enough to touch corresponding terminals of the host equipment for, at least, 1.0 millisecond since separation of the extraction detecting terminal from a corresponding terminal of the host equipment, with respect to an extraction speed of 2.5 meters/second; said power source feeding terminals are a power source terminal and a ground terminal; and any power source compensating capacitor is not connected between said power source terminal and said ground terminal.

The instant claims obviously encompass the claimed invention of '713 patent and differ only by terminology. To the extent that the present claims are broaden and therefore generic to the claimed invention of '713 application. In re Goodman 29 USPQ 2d 2010 CAFC 1993.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the application term by prohibiting claims in a second application not patentably distinct from claims of a first application. In re Vogel, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination with nay other references, fails to specifically teach the power source feeding terminals are long enough to keep touching corresponding terminals of the host equipment for, at least, a predetermined time-period since separation of the

Art Unit: 2887

extraction detecting terminal from a corresponding terminal of the host equipment; the power source feeding terminals are formed to be longer in an extraction direction than the extraction detecting terminal. These limitations in conjunction with other limitations in the claimed invention were not shown by the prior art of record.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWYN LABAZE whose telephone number is (571)272-2395. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Paik can be reached on (571) 272-2404. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/EDWYN LABAZE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2887
10/9/2008

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|--|
| <div>Application Number</div> <div></div> | Application/Control No. | Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination | |
| | 10/550,578 | NISHIZAWA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | EDWYN LABAZE | 2887 | |